```
1
                 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
                  MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
3
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                     Case No. 1:10CR71-1
 4
        VS.
                                     Greensboro, North Carolina
5
    DARIUS TREMAYNE BROOKS,
6
                                     January 19, 2011
 7
                                     9:47 a.m.
        Defendant.
8
 9
                        TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCE
10
            BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. OSTEEN, JR.
11
                    UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
    APPEARANCES:
13
14
    For the Government:
                          SANDRA HAIRSTON, AUSA
                          Office of the U.S. Attorney
                          101 S. Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor
15
                          Greensboro, North Carolina 27401
16
17
    For the Defendant:
                          JOHN A. DUSENBURY, AFPD
18
                          Office of the Federal Public Defender
                          301 N. Elm Street, Suite 410
                          Greensboro, North Carolina 27401
19
20
                          Joseph B. Armstrong, RMR, FCRR
21
    Court Reporter:
                          324 W. Market, Room 101
                          Greensboro, NC
22
                                          27401
23
            Proceedings reported by stenotype reporter.
24
        Transcript produced by Computer-Aided Transcription.
25
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

```
Greensboro, North Carolina
 1
 2
              January 19, 2011
 3
               (At 9:47 a.m., proceedings commenced.)
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Hairston?
 4
 5
              MS. HAIRSTON:
                             Yes, Your Honor, good morning.
 6
    Your Honor, the next case will be the United States of
 7
    America versus Darius Tremayne Brooks, Case No. 1:10CR71-1.
    Mr. Brooks is represented by John Dusenbury. The case is
 8
 9
    called for sentencing.
10
              THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Dusenbury.
              MR. DUSENBURY: Good morning, Your Honor.
11
12
              THE COURT: Are you and Mr. Brooks ready to
13
    proceed with this hearing?
              MR. DUSENBURY: We are.
14
15
              THE COURT:
                          Have you received a copy of the
16
    presentence report and reviewed it with Mr. Brooks?
17
              MR. DUSENBURY: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Are there any objections?
19
              MR. DUSENBURY:
                              Your Honor, we don't have any
20
    unresolved objections. However, there is just one minor
    factual correction that really doesn't have a direct bearing
21
    on the guidelines that Mr. Brooks asked me to bring to the
22
    Court's attention.
23
              It is in paragraph 36, probably the third from the
24
25
    last sentence says, "The defendant provides no support and
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

```
has no type of relationship with his son." He asked me to
 2
    inform the Court that he indeed does have a relationship
 3
    with that child. In fact, when he was -- Mr. Brooks --
    before he was incarcerated, he regularly kept his son on
 4
 5
               It's true he was not paying child support as
 6
    such, but he was -- he does have a relationship with his
 7
          That is a factor that I envisioned as having some
    son.
    significance under the 3553 factors.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Hairston, any
    objection to me considering that?
10
11
                             No, Your Honor.
              MS. HAIRSTON:
12
              THE COURT: All right. I'll take that -- I'll
13
    note that, Mr. Dusenbury. Any further matters in relation
    to the presentence report?
14
15
              MR. DUSENBURY: No, sir.
16
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Brooks, do you agree
17
    with Mr. Dusenbury; that is, first of all, you have reviewed
18
    the presentence report, is that correct?
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
19
20
              THE COURT:
                          And do you agree that with that one
    relatively minor change, there are no objections, is that
21
22
    correct?
23
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
24
              THE COURT: All right. You may have a seat,
25
    Mr. Brooks.
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

```
I will find in Mr. Brooks' case that -- I will
 1
 2
    adopt the presentence investigation report without change.
 3
    Mr. Brooks' offense of conviction, that is, the 922(q)
 4
    offense, does not carry a mandatory minimum sentence.
                                                             The
    resulting advisory guideline calculation is as follows:
 5
 6
              A total offense level of 25.
 7
              A criminal history category of IV.
              A quideline imprisonment range of 84 to 105
 8
 9
    months.
10
              A supervised release range of two to three years.
              A fine range of 10,000 to $100,000.
11
12
              A special assessment of $100 is mandatory.
13
              Mr. Dusenbury, will there be any additional
    evidence on behalf of Mr. Brooks?
14
15
              MR. DUSENBURY: No evidence, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT:
                           Then I will hear from you at this time
17
    as to what constitutes a sentence that is sufficient but not
18
    greater than necessary taking into consideration the
    advisory quideline calculation as well as all other factors
19
20
    set forth under 18 USC Section 3553.
21
              MR. DUSENBURY: Thank you, Your Honor.
22
    outset, I would like to point out, Your Honor, that
23
    Mr. Brooks' grandmother and his cousin are also present
    today.
24
25
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you both for taking the time to
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

come here today.

2.0

MR. DUSENBURY: Your Honor, I certainly have some very specific points I would like to make, but I'm thinking that the Court may well have specific questions or concerns that maybe my remarks might not get to as readily as could be accomplished. If there were particular things --

THE COURT: I'll ask them as you go along, Mr. Dusenbury.

MR. DUSENBURY: All right, sir. Your Honor, having in mind the mandate of 3553 -- and I was thinking specifically about the notion -- the concept of sufficiency, sufficiency of the sentence without being excessive.

It seems to me that whole idea of sufficiency is informed largely by perspective, and just no matter how accurate a presentence report is, the limitations of time, space, and investigative resources just limit the perspective, and I think that's particularly true with Mr. Brooks' case for this reason. Simply, reading the presentence report in its entirety, offense conduct and historical information taken together, one could easily come away with the conclusion that this was nothing more than a premeditated armed robbery of Mr. Brooks's cousin and her boyfriend for --

THE COURT: I would say that more likely premeditated armed robbery of the boyfriend, and the cousin

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

happened to show up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUSENBURY: Yes, sir. Well, that's what the Court -- that was one of the points that I wanted to make.

Your Honor, but even more than that I think is this -- and that is accurate as far as it goes. My contention is it just doesn't go far enough, because some of the most -- the facts that lend the greatest perspective are the facts that may lie between the facts set forth in the report.

For example, one is the relationship between Mr. Brooks -- of what the relationship was at the time of the offense between Mr. Brooks and Mr. Taylor, his codefendant. Mr. Brooks, who is now 21 years old, was 19 at the time. Mr. Taylor was at that time was around 23, or early twenties, 22, 23, 24, somewhere around there. had by that time become something of a street mentor to Mr. Brooks, a mentorship that, you know, is very easily understood in retrospect because Mr. Brooks, at age 10 -- in that year he lost both his mother, who, despite her problems with substances, loved him dearly. And I guess as he looks back on it, he realizes she may be one of the few people that he's come in contact with in his life who actually loved him unconditionally, despite her problems. also lost his father who was sent to federal prison when he was 10 years old.

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

And from that time until now, he actually has been bounced around from household to household. And it's fortunate that he had relatives who were willing to take him in; but he pointed out to me that, you know, even if you're in the household of an uncle or an aunt and their cousins -- you're surrounded by cousins who are more or less your same age, that you are -- there is -- there is still a palpable void. I mean, you're still an outsider, notwithstanding the best intentions. I'm sure we all know that children can be fairly cruel to each other, and those things had an impact on him.

Now, I'm talking about -- I've alluded to
Mr. Taylor's mentorship. Well, it's not like that was a
mentorship that was imposed on Mr. Brooks. Mr. Brooks chose
that mentor. But that was a choice made at 16, 17, 18 years
old after really not having had the -- a man in his life to
mentor him or instruct him or guide him or provide an
example of what manhood looks like when directed along the
proper path.

As the presentence report reflects, his father, who apparently the mentorship offered while Mr. Brooks's mother and father were in the same household had to do -- was mostly drug abuse and violence. That was what he was -- that was what was implanted in his subconscious as a young boy. And so that --

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

THE COURT: I meant to ask you. In paragraph 35, according to the defendant's father in his presentence report, Valencia Brooks was addicted to cocaine base and died of an aneurysm in July of 2000. The defendant described his relationship with Ms. Brooks as one centered around smoking crack and violence, but she -- does that mean he, that is, your client, the defendant, was the one saying that his relationship was centered around smoking crack and violence or the defendant's father? MR. DUSENBURY: I took it to mean the latter, Your Honor. PROBATION AGENT: I can clarify that, Your Honor. I caught that this morning. That was Mr. Perkins' statement. THE COURT: Okay. So it's the -- okay. you. I caught that the first time. Something you said reminded me I wasn't sure about that. All right. You may go ahead. MR. DUSENBURY: So -- and I was just alluding,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUSENBURY: So -- and I was just alluding,
Your Honor, to what I think are some significant historical
facts that led to Mr. Brooks being where he was on this day.

Another fact that I think is relative to the perspective that we're talking about, Your Honor, is not that it -- it certainly doesn't excuse the crime, it may not even mitigate the crime significantly, but that is the fact

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

that Mr. Shuff -- who, by the way, is now deceased, he was killed -- was at that time a drug dealer. Mr. Brooks obviously knew that his cousin dated Shuff, but another one of these facts that I'm alluding to, Your Honor, is actually something that Mr. Brooks just recently shared with me. I didn't know this at the time of change of plea.

But as -- and that was a conversation between himself and Taylor just before the robbery occurred, because Mr. Brooks knew that his cousin lived at this residence. And he told Taylor, look, if my cousin's there, I'm not going through with this. He at least appreciated the possibility that what they were about to do could have some terrible negative ramifications for his cousin whom he loved very, very much. And when -- after staking the place out for about 20 minutes or so, they realized that the cousin was not at home, which she later confirmed in her statement to police. She and her mother had been to Wal-Mart. In fact, the cousin reported --

THE COURT: What do you think -- what do you think then contributes to the decision, the conscious decision, of if my cousin is here, I'm not going to participate in the robbery. Then when the cousin shows up, instead of running, instead of leaving, they put a gun to the cousin -- one puts a gun to the cousin's head.

MR. DUSENBURY: Yes, sir.

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

1 THE COURT: And then one or both tie the cousin up 2 and put her in the closet. 3 MR. DUSENBURY: Yes, sir. THE COURT: How do we go from "If she's there, 4 5 we're not going to do this, " to, "Well, now she's here, 6 let's tie her up, and put her in the closet." 7 MR. DUSENBURY: I think it's panic. I think --8 THE COURT: Why would you panic that way instead 9 of running? 10 MR. DUSENBURY: And, Judge, of course, that is the question, and that question is unanswerable, I would 11 12 contend. You know, because there's so many of the 13 unfortunate choices that probably all of us have made in our life that looking back on we ask that same question: why did 14 15 I do this rather than do that? Fortunately --16 THE COURT: We definitely -- everybody in this 17 courtroom, I'm sure, asks that question about a number of 18 decisions they've made. Yes, sir. 19 MR. DUSENBURY: 20 THE COURT: But I doubt -- I don't -- nobody's 21 made a decision like this. Let me put it in perspective. 22 As I listened to you talk, Mr. Dusenbury, I was thinking about an article I read a while back and -- the 23 24 crime that I was reading about has got nothing to do with 25 this case. But it was in a terrorism case, and there was

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

apparently some indication that the defendant was going to claim the defense of entrapment which would then lead to whether or not the Government could prove that the defendant was predisposed to it. It was all speculative.

2.0

But the writer of this article raised a point, which is, how do you -- what normal American citizen would you ever believe was predisposed to commit a terrorist act or not commit a terrorist act? In other words, what they were saying was nobody that we know of normal in society walks around thinking about or is predisposed toward committing a terrorist act. It just goes beyond the pale. Do you understand what I'm saying so far --

MR. DUSENBURY: I think so.

THE COURT: -- or follow what I'm saying so far?

And to a certain degree, sometimes I look at these
robberies, and I can't understand how they progress in the
manner which they do.

Now, even without your comments, it is clear -- I mean, in paragraph 7, "While she was in the closet, she heard a man come to the closet door several times and say, Renee, I love you, and I love Kwami. Renee Martin recognized the voice as belonging to Damian Levonne Taylor."

And so you look at -- I look at this situation, and it really defies explanation to tie somebody up, put them in the closet, kidnap them, do all these things to them

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

at gunpoint and then turn around and make these comments that, it seems to me, clearly are going to disclose who you are; and, second, just are completely -- I don't know any other way to say it other than just crazy in the middle of a robbery. It just doesn't make any sense at all.

2.0

But it's not my duty to understand it. One of my responsibilities is to decide what sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant. So when I'm confronted with an offense like this, even if I look at it and say the defendant had no structure, no advantage, no family structure, just really nothing during the course of their childhood, and that makes the crime at least in some respects understandable, no structure, this is where Mr. Brooks ended up. But on the other hand, I've got to decide what's necessary to make sure that Mr. Brooks doesn't do this again.

So how do I lay a logic yard stick against this type of conduct and say, oh, well, 84 months is enough or 105 months is enough or 120 months is enough, if part of my responsibilities is to protect the public no matter how understandable the end result of Mr. Brooks' commission of this offense may be?

MR. DUSENBURY: Well, Your Honor, I would say this. First, I think that perhaps we may look amiss if we

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

look for logic where it really doesn't exist, because I agree with the Court, there is no logical explanation to the conduct -- the contradictory conduct that we're talking about. But I disagree with the Court in terms of a duty to understand, because I think it's -- I think it is -- it's not logical, but it is understandable. I think --

THE COURT: Well, let me back up. I admit I see a lot of things that I realize I will never understand, and I accept that. But I do have a responsibility to come to some understanding of what sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve these factors set out under 3553, one of which is to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant and to provide adequate deterrence --

MR. DUSENBURY: Absolutely.

THE COURT: -- to criminal conduct, two of which are. So how do I take that kind of logical factor or those rational factors and apply them to something like this in this case?

MR. DUSENBURY: Your Honor, I think we do that or at least we approach that by trying to glean -- since one of the other factors that the Court has to weigh in fashioning the sentence is the history of the defendant -- trying to glean to the extent that week, and even though, granted --

THE COURT: Does his history suggest a lesser sentence or a greater sentence?

MR. DUSENBURY: Well, for the reasons that I'm probably not doing a good job of articulating, I think a lower sentence for this reason. Because I think there is a duty to at least attempt to understand what was going through his mind at the time, even as it relates to this conduct that is inexplicable logically, because that, more than anything else -- more than the result of this crime, the thing that informs the extent to which the public needs to be protected from this man is what's going on inside him. And, granted, I mean, none of us can know that, but I think there are clues that suggest why he did the thing that caused him to be here today. And maybe even -- certainly imperfectly, and probably more imperfectly what he's likely to do in the future. But as imperfect as those indicators are, I think we still have a duty to at least look at them.

2.0

And going back to the Court's original point about the article that you read about the terrorist. The parallel I see here, Your Honor, is that one person's terrorism is another person's heroism. Nobody sets out to be a terrorist, but a number of people set out to be heroes; and because of some warped thinking, they come to a place where they perceive the conduct that normal people would regard as antisocial as heroic. That, I think, is the explanation.

Your Honor, for whatever reason I'm reminded of a scene in the movie Training Day. Did the Court happen to

see that movie?

2.0

THE COURT: Many times.

MR. DUSENBURY: All right. Well, it's the scene where Denzel Washington's partner is abandoned in the apartment of these Hispanic drug dealers who are about to kill him. At the end of that scene when the leader of that group discovers that this guy had been instrumental in helping his young cousin, and they're about to let him go, he says, look, it was nothing personal. You know, I was about to blow your head off with a shotgun in the bathtub, but it was nothing personal. Now, none of us can really get our minds around that kind of thinking, but that is the kind -- they regarded murder as just business. It's nothing personal, it's just business.

It's something on -- something like that kind of thinking, I think, Your Honor, is common. Not uncommon. It's common to people who think that it's a good idea to rob any -- another person, whether it's a drug dealer or not. They come to a place -- nobody starts off thinking that way, but as a result of experiences and influences and examples and decisions. It's not just stuff that happens to us, it's stuff that we decide -- the way we decide to deal with stuff that happens to us. We know people have come through situations like what Mr. Brooks has experienced and make totally different choices. We know that.

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

But I think it's a function of -- it's a function of, again, the term the totality of the circumstances or really the totality of the influences that inform the choices that cause someone to think that, okay, this isn't personal. I'm robbing this guy for business reasons, but at least I'm being principled enough to say that if my cousin is there, I'm not going through with it. And then to be surprised by the cousin, to act in the way they acted, I think, is -- the only explanation is panic.

THE COURT: Okay. And if I accept all that and the reasons that Mr. Brooks got to where he was, then tell me what I should do in terms of a sentence when someone has gotten to the point where they can make the business decision that Mr. Brooks and his partner made in committing this robbery. Does that mean a lower sentence is enough?

Does that mean higher? What --

MR. DUSENBURY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Within the parameters of 922(g), what do you think I should do?

MR. DUSENBURY: I think a sentence of seven years, which is about -- no, it's exactly one-third of the -- of his life to date, which happens to be the low end of the guideline range, is sufficient without being excessive under 3553 for a number of reasons.

He has already been incarcerated 19 months,

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

granted, in state custody, for this conduct. None of that time will count toward his federal sentence. It's virtually certain that the state -- in fact, he has a trial date of March, I think, the 4th on his state charges, the robbery, etc., arising from the same conduct.

2.0

So no -- not -- I have no idea what's going to happen there. Chances are he'll be convicted. So he will get some additional time in addition to the 19 months that he's already served. I understand different jurisdiction, different crime, but same conduct.

He has never been incarcerated before now. He's not -- not only -- the longest sentence that he's previously served is a sentence that he's serving now awaiting disposition of these charges, both federally and state. Seven years added to what he's already facing, given what he's done in the past, Your Honor, is in my opinion sufficient.

There's one other factor, again, one of these interstitial facts that I think is significant. The common law robbery offense, it's accurate as far as it goes, but what it doesn't report, Your Honor, is that that incident involved at least four other, maybe -- four or five other individuals, and the gentlemen, the victim -- and it arose because the victim had, at least in the view of Mr. Brooks and some of his cohorts, had been perhaps inappropriately

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

friendly with different girlfriends, a girl Mr. Brooks was interested in at the time, a girl that one of the other gentleman was interested in at the time, and this was just a fight. Four or five guys jumped on this one guy, beat him up, and, oddly enough Mr. Brooks neither got the money nor the amplifier.

2.0

But it doesn't change what occurred, that he was, in fact, charged with that offense, that he was convicted of that offense, that he engaged in the conduct. It's just that in the absence of a context, it looks like what we have here, that is, in our case, is nothing more than a continuation of a pattern that he started maybe a few months early, and it's not really. This is on an order of magnitude that's different from anything that he had done in his past, including the common law robbery.

All those factors taken together, I guess you can lump that under the history and characteristics of the defendant, from the family -- and the last thing, Judge, I'll mention is this, because I am going to ask the Court to recommend a Bureau of Prisons placement -- a designation of FCI Butner. But -- as the report indicates, his father is at FCI Butner, and he told me just yesterday, I think it was, that while he's not had any -- his father has not offered to be a mentor to him, a main -- who knows what the reasons are, until just recently when -- and Mr. Brooks told

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

me that his father has communicated with him and said, look, if you can get to Butner, I'll look out for you. You know, I've got -- and if I'm no longer here, there are people here who care about me who will take care of you. It's just -- I just -- the irony of that, it's just overwhelming that now in -- as an incarcerated person, the father is now offering mentorship.

Well, I think it is what it is. But for all of those reasons, Your Honor, the sentence that I contend to be sufficient without being excessive is the sentence of seven years for all the reasons that I just mentioned. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dusenbury.

Ms. Hairston, does the Government wish to be heard?

MS. HAIRSTON: Your Honor, I'll be honest. I don't quite know what to say, but I am going to say a couple of things.

Right versus wrong. He knows right versus wrong.

That's the first thing I'm going to say. It's as simple as that. A lot of us have suffered through the loss of a parent as a young child. I'm one of those people. Now, my parents were not drug addicts, and they didn't commit crimes. But we all have a story, and we all are responsible for what we choose to do with the hand we're dealt. He was dealt a bad hand, but he knows right from wrong.

And to argue to this Court that it's nothing

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

personal, it's just business, that I'm going to rob somebody knowing full well that it's his cousin's house, and he still went there. He still went. He cannot sit here at 21 years old or 19, the age he was when this happened, and try to blame that on somebody else. He made that decision.

2.0

Yes, he had a bad childhood, and that's a terrible thing, and I'm not saying that this Court should not consider that, but not for a low end sentence, not when you knowingly go into somebody's house and put a gun to somebody's head, tie them up, and try to rob them just because they're a drug dealer, and you put another innocent person at risk. And she apparently has a child. What if the child had been there? Was there ever going to be a point where this was going to turn out right? No. There was never going to be a point where this was going to turn out right. So whether he thinks it's personal or not, it was personal. It was clearly personal.

And the other thing I'll say, Your Honor, is, quite frankly, in my opinion 120 months would be the sentence to impose in this case. I know the Court's not going to do that, but I just think Mr. Brooks needs to think about this. He needs to understand that he has some personal responsibility here. All aside from what he grew up with as a child, he has to at some point take responsibility for himself.

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

He left that crime and went on a school ground with a gun, a loaded gun in his pocket with a round in the chamber, around other people. What was he going to do there? If somebody looked at him the wrong way or if somebody looked at his girlfriend the wrong way there, what was he going to do then?

Right versus wrong, Your Honor. That's all I'm saying. He knows right versus wrong.

THE COURT: I don't know that it makes a lot of difference, but I'm not sure whether -- initially, when I read the report, I wasn't sure but what that wasn't a school function. But now I gather rereading it that it was July 4, and people had gone to Eden Morehead to watch the fireworks.

MS. HAIRSTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Not that that -- I think it would be significantly different if the firearm was on school grounds while school was in session.

MS. HAIRSTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Not that it otherwise mitigates it all, but it did -- the way I finally understood it was that that was just gathering at night to watch the fireworks at that Eden Morehead High School.

MS. HAIRSTON: And on that particular occasion,
Your Honor, when you've got a holiday where there are people
in a festive mood who may or may not be in one state of

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

intoxication or another, it's ripe for something to happen, whether he intended for it or not. And I'm not saying he went there to hurt anybody. I'm simply saying it's another instance, Your Honor, in a chain of decisions of choosing between right and wrong.

And it's clear to me that he knows the difference between right and wrong, because if he made the statement about my cousin being there, and I'm not going to go through with it, he knows the difference between right and wrong.

Don't go there to do it to begin with. Make that choice.

So he has a responsibility to himself, to his family, to those children that he has to learn to make the decision --- the right decision as opposed to the wrong decision.

And let me just say this about going to Butner.

I'd ask the Court to deny that request, because I can't see any benefit coming from that; and whatever his father means by saying he'll look out for him or have somebody look out for him, no good's going to come from that.

THE COURT: I can understand the request, but I agree with Ms. Hairston on that one. I think to make that recommendation unfairly impinges on the Bureau of Prisons' responsibility to make its own security risks and assessments, and I can see -- I could see why Mr. Brooks would want to go there, but I can also see where the Bureau of Prisons might say if we start housing family members of

various types of criminal activity together, that presents its own special risks in terms of alignments and associations. So I'm going to decline to do that. I'll let the Bureau of Prisons decide that on their own.

All right. Mr. Brooks, you are not required to say anything. If you choose to remain silent, your silence will not be held against you in any way whatsoever, but you do have the right to address the Court before any sentence is imposed; and if you wish to address the Court, now is the appropriate time.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I want to say that I know -- I'm not trying to put no blame on nobody else for my actions. I know what I did was wrong, you know what I'm saying. But -- and, yeah, you know what I'm saying, I can make my own decisions. But at that time I felt like that's the only thing I knew how to do, you know what I'm saying. I've got kids to take care of. Like she said, that's my responsibility. People got responsibility. Some people don't go about it the right way, the legal way. I went by what I knew. So -- I've got to catch myself. I'm getting upset.

THE COURT: You went by what you knew. What was it that you knew?

THE DEFENDANT: Like all the wrong things. I'm not going to sit here and lie. I know what I did was wrong,

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

but I felt like -- she said I need time to think about what I feel like seven years is enough time to better I've done. myself. I'm willing to better myself. I always have. I messed up my school years, and I felt like I never had another opportunity. I never had nobody to take me in and show me things. My grandma kept me, but my papa can't teach me how to go out and be a man --THE COURT: You have a half-brother or stepbrother who is in the Air Force. You lived with him for a while. THE DEFENDANT: You're right, Your Honor. like I said, that was when I was in school. THE COURT: And I assume --THE DEFENDANT: I messed that life up. what I'm saying, I understand. THE COURT: I assumed from what I read that your half-brother -- he sounded like he was a very solid individual. Maybe it was good for -- maybe it was good, maybe it was bad, I don't know. But he certainly didn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

sound like he would have been showing you robberies and other illegal ways to make money. And then you've got your grandmother seated back there, and I suspect that your grandmother wasn't teaching you illegal ways to make money like robberies.

So where did you acquire this knowledge of committing robberies to get money for your children? Where

did that knowledge come from?

THE DEFENDANT: Growing up from, you know what I'm saying, living with my mother and my father. I saw my daddy -- I'm not just talking about robberies. When I say illegal things, I'm -- drugs, selling drugs. I'm talking about that, too. That's what I saw. That's how I saw money coming in. I never had nobody teach me how to fix cars or paint houses.

THE COURT: Who taught you how to commit a robbery?

THE DEFENDANT: I mean, nobody had to teach me how. I mean, you know what I'm saying, anybody can, you know what I'm saying. But that's not the point. I don't want to get deep into that. I know what I did was --

THE COURT: I'm responding to what you said,
Mr. Brooks, because you said you were doing what you knew
how to do; and you didn't know how to do these legal things,
so you chose to do the things you knew how to do.

THE DEFENDANT: I was around the wrong people, the wrong set of people. You hang around the wrong people that's doing the same thing that you grew up -- you know what I'm saying, you grew up around, you know what I'm saying, selling drugs. Eventually, it brushes off on you, and you watch them, and you eventually pick up on it, you know what I'm saying.

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

```
But anybody -- anybody take you out and show you
 1
 2
    how to sell a rock or sell a blunt or make some quick money.
    But it's not going to be just anybody that shows you how to
 3
    do things.
                I messed up with my own family at a young age,
 4
    and I dug myself in a deep hole where I couldn't get out of
 6
    it. But, I mean, I'm learning from my mistakes right now.
 7
    This is my first time being in this situation.
 8
              I feel like if -- I feel like when I do go to
 9
    prison, I do want to take trades and better myself so I know
10
    then me knowing more I'll have a chance when I come home.
11
    But at the same time I feel like my kids need my -- I've got
12
    family like everybody else, and I know seven years from now
    I'll have all kind of trades, something I didn't have before
13
    I went in.
14
15
              Even if I get 105 months, it's still -- it's
    still -- that's just longer away from my family. Nothing is
16
17
    going to change. I will still go home. I just ask that you
18
    find it in your heart to understand me. I know my wrong.
    I'm admitting to my wrong. Just give me a chance to be home
19
20
    with my family so I can do right.
                          And how many years did you go to Eden
21
              THE COURT:
22
    Morehead High School, two years?
23
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes, sir.
24
              THE COURT: And what classes did you take, do you
25
    remember?
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

```
THE DEFENDANT: When I was in Morehead High
 1
 2
    School, they never gave me a chance to take regular classes.
    I was in behavior classes.
 3
              THE COURT: All right. Who were your teachers?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              I can't remember their names.
 5
 6
              THE COURT: Did you have one that you liked better
 7
    than others?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I did.
 9
              THE COURT:
                         Who was that? Can you remember?
10
    it a man or a woman?
11
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              It was a woman. I can't remember
12
    her name. I can't remember her name, but she taught
              I can't remember her name.
13
    history.
              THE COURT: American history, world history?
14
15
    you remember what kind of history?
16
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              It was U.S. history.
17
              THE COURT: And you enjoyed the class?
18
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: Did you learn a lot?
19
20
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              I didn't -- at that time I
    wasn't -- I wasn't trying to learn a lot, you know what I'm
21
22
    saying. When I was in history class --
23
              THE COURT: My point is this, Mr. Brooks. Exactly
    what you just said. I understand your unfortunate
24
25
    circumstances. I didn't live through your unfortunate
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

circumstances, but I can read about them, and I understand them. But even without a family, even without a mother and a father, there was a teacher at Morehead who tried to teach you something that you could have used had you been willing to listen and do that, but you weren't ready. So what is it that makes you ready now?

THE DEFENDANT: Sometimes you've got to be in certain situations to understand.

THE COURT: And what is that situation?

THE DEFENDANT: Just being away from my family.

If it's seven years, I know I don't want to go through this again, and I won't go through this again. I just ask -- I know when I do go to prison, I'll be able to better myself, and that's what I'm going to do. Whether it's 105 months, 84 months, when I get out, I am going to do right, but I ask you --

THE COURT: And I'm not putting you down. I'm just making this point. You didn't do that when you had the chance at Eden Morehead High School, so what is going to make you do it now?

THE DEFENDANT: Because I know how to quit. My freedom can be taken away from me from doing the things I was doing. When you out there in that world, you don't think about being locked up for a long time, being away from your family. All you think about is your kids taking care

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

```
of, you helping who you live with, and that's what I did.
    know it's not right, but I learned from my mistakes.
 2
 3
    months --
              THE COURT: A mistake.
                                      Let me ask you this.
 4
                                                             When
    you were 19 years old, if somebody had done to your kids
 5
 6
    what you did to your cousin, what would your reaction to
 7
    what they had done been?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: If somebody did it to my kids?
 9
              THE COURT:
                         Came in the house, held your kids at
10
    gunpoint, tied them up, and put them in the closet. You
    wouldn't be thinking of that as a mistake, would you?
11
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Me personally -- you probably
13
    wouldn't believe me; but if that person came to talk to me
    and gave me an understanding of how he didn't know no
14
15
    better, I would believe him. Why?
                                        Because I've been
16
    through the same thing.
17
              THE COURT: How he didn't know no better?
18
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               I mean --
19
              THE COURT: How in the world could he possibly not
    know it was wrong to do something like that?
20
21
              THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I mean, I knew it was
    wrong, but when I say didn't know any better, I mean you
22
23
    don't think about being taken away from your family.
    just know what's going on, what you're doing is making some
24
25
    money, and it's at that point in time. You don't think
```

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

about getting away from your family. Now I'm in this 1 2 predicament, I'm being took away from my family. 3 THE COURT: Because of what, Mr. Brooks? THE DEFENDANT: Because --4 5 THE COURT: Why are you being taken away? 6 THE DEFENDANT: I did something I shouldn't have 7 did. 8 THE COURT: Who is responsible for that? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Me, and I -- you know what I'm 10 saying, I accept -- you know what I'm saying, I know what I did, you know what I'm saying, was wrong. But my father got 11 12 tooken away from me at 10. Yeah, what he was doing was 13 wrong, but he had his own concrete business, too. know he wouldn't have taught me the wrong that he was doing. 14 15 He would have taught me how to lay concrete. If I knew how to do that, I would have laid concrete because that's what I 16 17 knew how to do. If I had knew how to do it, I would have 18 done it. If I had had somebody there to teach me how to be a man, I would have been a man, but I didn't. 19 20 Yeah, I lived with my brother. He was in the Air 21 He worked. I went to school. But at the same time, Force. 22 it was -- that was it. I come home, play the video game 23 after school, that was it. He'd come home from work, he'd cook, we'd watch TV, and go to sleep. That was it. 24 25 know my father could have taught me how to be a man.

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

I don't want to talk about them because I did what I did. It's is my fault, Your Honor. I really would appreciate it if I could get the 84 months. I'm going to better myself either way I go, 84 months or 105 months. I just hope that you understand what I'm saying. I done said mostly everything that was on my mind. I just put it up in God's hands.

THE COURT: I appreciate you talking to me,
Mr. Brooks, and I think -- although I reach different
conclusions from what you reach, I think I understand more
about what you're saying than perhaps you would give me
credit for, although we might not reach the same conclusion
about what you're saying and what it means in terms of what
type of sentence should be imposed.

To give you an example, you were previously convicted of a misdemeanor breaking and entering, a common law robbery, and an affray. I think in the affray you might have gotten 30 days or something. But no active sentences imposed for those priors, pretty much?

THE DEFENDANT: In the simple affray, that happened while I was in jail this time.

THE COURT: I'm not criticizing, I'm just pointing out what your prior sentences were. Suppose for that common law robbery instead of getting a probationary sentence, you had gotten a sentence of 24 months. And I'm not saying it

was right or wrong for you not to get it. Then it wouldn't catch you so much by surprise to be standing here in federal court facing 7 to 10. Maybe you would have gotten the message then.

If I go too high, I'm not being fair to you. But if I go too low, then you and others like you won't understand the seriousness of the conduct that you've engaged in. Do you understand that?

You don't have to comment on that, I'm just saying. I listened to you, and I'm hearing what you say, but I may reach different conclusions from which you think I ought to reach. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: (Nodding.)

THE COURT: In Mr. Brooks' case, it seems to me that a sentence within the advisory guideline range is sufficient but not greater than necessary. I am not going to the bottom of the guideline range. I will impose a sentence of 96 months in Mr. Brooks' case.

In fashioning that sentence, I do think, as Ms. Hairston rightfully pointed out, that given the conduct involved in this offense, there are probably some very rational, reasonable reasons to go above the guidelines to the 120-month maximum. I will not do that in this case.

Upon consideration of the advisory guideline calculation as well as all other factors set forth under

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

18 USC Section 3553, I will note in relation to those factors that in terms of the nature and circumstances of the offense, Mr. Brooks' conduct in this case, and that is the offense conduct in possessing the firearm during the course of a robbery as well as on the grounds at Eden Morehead High School after the robbery had been committed, certainly rises to what the Court considers to be the more, if not the most, serious level of an offense conduct underlying a 922(g) conviction.

2.0

Looking at the history and characteristics of the defendant, I do realize that the defendant has had very difficult circumstances as a young person. He's had some opportunities, though, that a lot of people don't have in terms of his half-brother and his grandmother and various other things. But, on the other hand, defendant was 19 at the time this offense was committed, and I do find that his age at the time of the offense in terms of immaturity and irresponsibility was a factor that mitigates against -- in some respects mitigates against the maximum sentence in this case. This is a serious offense, and the need to deter this type of criminal conduct as well as others similarly situated is very significant.

For those reasons, the Court finds that a sentence of 96 months followed by three years of supervised release is sufficient but not greater than necessary, and I will

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

impose that sentence on the terms -- with the supervised release on the terms and conditions set forth in the presentence report.

Mr. Dusenbury, anything further you want to address before I impose that sentence?

2.0

MR. DUSENBURY: Only in light of the Court's observations regarding the BOP recommendation, I wondered if the Court might consider including a recommendation that he be housed at a facility other than Butner as near as possible to his place of residence thinking of his family having access and being able to visit him.

THE COURT: I will recommend as close to his home as possible, and I will recommend him to a facility where he may participate in an intensive substance abuse treatment program.

It is not lost on me, Mr. Dusenbury, and it's part of the -- I think the defendant's -- I don't know if you want to say immaturity. That may be an overstatement. But one of the reasons I'm recommending Mr. Brooks to the facility where he can receive intensive substance abuse treatment is his acknowledged daily use of marijuana.

MR. DUSENBURY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That's not a free habit he's undertaking there, and to a certain degree to hear Mr. Brooks' concern over his children and his need to be

there for his children is offset by the conduct that he apparently chose to participate in while he had the opportunity to be there with his children. But I will recommend him for an intensive substance abuse treatment program.

In Case No. 1:10CR71-1, United States versus

Darius Tremayne Brooks, as to Count One, it is hereby
ordered that the defendant is committed to the custody of
the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 96 months followed by
three years of supervised release. A special assessment of
\$100 is mandatory, is hereby imposed, and is due and payable
immediately. A fine is waived because of the defendant's
inability to pay, and restitution is not applicable in
Mr. Brooks' case.

During the period of supervised release, it is ordered that the defendant shall comply with the standard terms and conditions of supervised release. In addition to the standard terms and conditions, the following special conditions are imposed:

One, the defendant shall provide any requested financial information to the probation officer.

Two, the defendant shall not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer.

Three, the defendant shall submit to substance

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

abuse testing at any time as directed by the probation officer. The defendant shall cooperatively participate in a substance abuse treatment program which may include drug testing and inpatient or residential treatment and pay for those treatment services as directed by the probation officer. During the course of any treatment, the defendant shall abstain from the use of any alcoholic beverages.

2.0

Mr. Brooks, you do have the right to appeal the sentence that I have imposed in this case. If you choose to appeal, notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the entry of any judgment. If you wish to appeal and cannot afford the services of counsel, counsel will be appointed to represent you at no additional cost to you. Mr. Dusenbury will be responsible for advising you with respect to your right to appeal and filing any notice of appeal if you should instruct him to do so.

Anything further, Mr. Dusenbury?

MR. DUSENBURY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Hairston?

MS. HAIRSTON: Your Honor, we would move to dismiss Count Two pursuant to the plea agreement, and we would ask the Court for a destruction order if a lawful owner cannot be found.

THE COURT: I will order the destruction of the firearm at the conclusion of any appeals period if a lawful

owner cannot be reasonably located, and I will order the dismissal of Count Two pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement. Hold on one minute.

2.0

I will recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that the defendant be designated to a facility as close to his home as possible, and I will also recommend that the defendant be designated to a facility where he may participate in an intensive substance abuse treatment program.

Mr. Brooks, you are certainly free to disagree with me on this, as I may very well be wrong. But in spite of your comments that you did not want to blame anyone else for your predicament and were taking responsibility, I heard a lot of comments that suggest a deference to deflect blame for your conduct. And until you -- at least in my mind, until you hit that first point of moving forward like you talked about, accepting responsibility for what you've done and responsibility for those decisions, you're going to have a tough time. But some of what you said is exactly right, and you can do some good things if you will follow your own advice in some respects.

Anything further, Mr. Dusenbury?

MR. DUSENBURY: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Good luck to you both.

24 We'll stand in recess until 2:30.

(At 10:43 a.m., break taken.)

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011

CERTIFICATE I, JOSEPH B. ARMSTRONG, RMR, FCRR, United States District Court Reporter for the Middle District of North Carolina, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: That the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within-entitled action; that I reported the same in stenotype to the best of my ability; and thereafter reduced same to typewriting through the use of Computer-Aided Transcription. Joseph B. Armstrong RMR, FC United States Court Reporter Date: 04/08/11 RMR, FCRR 324 W. Market Street Greensboro, NC 

US v. Brooks - Sentence - January 19, 2011